

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|---|----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/676,844 | 09/29/2000 | Bryan R White | 10559-165001/P8249 | 3643 | |
| 20985 75 | 590 10/22/2003 | | EXAMI | EXAMINER | |
| FISH & RICHARDSON, PC 12390 EL CAMINO REAL | | | MONESTIME, MACKLY | | |
| SAN DIEGO, CA 92130-2081 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 2676 | | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 10/22/2003 | 13 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| a | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|---|---|---|----------------|--|
| Advisory Action | 09/676,844 | WHITE, BRYAN R | | |
| ,, , , | Examiner | Art Unit | , | |
| | Mackly Monestime | 2676 | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 11 August 2003 FAILS TO PLACE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appears Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | void abandonment of this applice I) a timely filed amendment whi | cation. A proper reply to a | ∍d | |
| PERIOD FOR RE | PLY [check either a) or b)] | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). | an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE | the final rejection. FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moteraned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in t | fee. The appropriate extension fee un the final Office action; or (2) as set for | nder rth in | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR | R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of | eriod set forth in of the appeal. | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be | ecause: | | | |
| (a) they raise new issues that would require further | er consideration and/or search (| see NOTE below); | | |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be | pelow); | | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or | n better form for appeal by mat | erially reducing or simplifying | , the | |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. | | | | |
| NOTE: | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject | | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | | | |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because: Se | | idered but does NOT place to | he | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection. | cause it is not directed SOLELY | to issues which were newly | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we | $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{s})$ a) $\mathbf{\boxtimes}$ will not be entered or bould be rejected is provided below |) will be entered and an own or appended. | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: None. | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: None. | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: 1-16. | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | |
| 8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is | a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapp | proved by the Examiner. | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme | nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | · | | |
| 10. Other: | M | MATTHEW C. BELLA | , | |
| | SI | MATTHEW C. BELLA IPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINE | D. | |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 04-01)

Advisory Action

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600 No. 13

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached Applicant's arguments filed on August 11, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argue that Fisher et al did not disclosed a memory controller hub and an internal graphics subsystem. Contrary to Applicant's arguments, Fisher et al did disclose a memory controller hub (Fig.1, Item No. 12), Fisher et al further disclosed that texture mapping hardware susbsystem typically include a local memory cache (col. 1, lines 58-61). Furthermore, Ajanovic et al disclosed a memory controller which includes an internal graphics subsystem adapted to perform graphics operations on data (Fig. Items No. 110, 113; col 3, lines 45-47). Therefore, the rejectio finally stands.